

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed December 19, 2002. Claims 2, 20, 32, and 33 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-19, and 21-31 are pending.

Claims 1-8 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over International Publication No. WO 95/17711 Boulton et al. ("Boulton").

Claims 10-17, 22, 23, and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boulton.

Claims 9 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boulton in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,924,072 Havens ("Havens").

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claims 1-8 and 18-21 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Boulton.

Claim 1 includes the following limitations:

identifying a plurality of transactions associated with a first user, the plurality of transactions comprising completed transactions in which the first user participated;

communicating user interface information to a client via a communications network, the user interface information including transaction information concerning at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions and specifying a single feedback interface facilitating user input of feedback information for each of the at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions; and

receiving the feedback information, provided by the first user through the single feedback interface, for each of at least the first and second transactions, the feedback information being received via the communications network.

Claim 18 includes the following limitations:

displaying transaction identification information for each of a plurality of transactions within the single user interface displayed on a

display device, the plurality of transactions comprising completed transactions in which the first user participated; and

displaying a feedback input for each of the plurality of transactions within the single user interface as displayed on the display device, ...

(Claim 1 and Claim 18, emphasis added)

Claims 1-8, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) stand rejected as being unpatentable over Boulton. To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. Boulton discloses collecting feedback from users regarding a product, process or service. For example, the feedback for analog testing, as shown in Figure 6, is presented within a window. The window can include a number of predetermined common feedback selections or a text input window for custom feedback. Conversely, the present claim 1 requires identifying a plurality of transactions associated with a first user, the plurality of transactions comprising completed transactions in which the first user participated. Although Boulton does discuss presenting feedback options for a selected product, process or service, it does not disclose identifying a plurality of completed transactions in which the first user participated.

Further, as mentioned above, Boulton discloses a window, as shown in Figure 6, for receiving feedback. The window can be utilized to input a number of predetermined feedback selections, or alternatively, to input text via a text input window for custom feedback. However, the feedback window only receives feedback input for a single product, process, or service. In contrast, the present claims require receiving feedback information, provided by the user, through a single feedback interface for each of at least the first and second transactions.

In sum, Boulton only discloses receiving feedback for the specific transactions in a serial fashion, unlike the present claims wherein feedback pertaining to a plurality of transactions can be received within a single interface. Further, the feedback as recited in claim 1 is for completed transactions in which a user participated and not merely feedback on the product, process or service itself. Because independent claims 30 and 31 have substantially similar limitations as claims 1 and 18, the same arguments that applied to claims 1 and 18 also apply to claims 30 and 31. Therefore, for at least the

reasons stated above, independent claims 1, 18, 30, 31 and dependent claims 3-7 and 19 are patentable over Boulton.

Dependent claims 9, 10-17, 22-24 and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boulton. Because dependent claims are deemed to include all the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the rejection of claims 9, 10-17, 22-24 and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. is 103(a) is also addressed by the above remarks

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 05/21/ 2003



André L. Marais  
Reg. No. 48,095

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 947-8200